Comment No.	Section	Page	Paragraph	Comment / Question	Response to Comment-Proposed Revision
GLO-1	1.1	1	Footnote	Is the sensitivity analysis required by the USEPA in the letter dated September 12, 2012, included as Section 2.2 in this document? If so, please state that in this footnote. This is not clear from the present state of the text.	
GLO-2	1.1.2	3	Bullet 1	What concentrations of dioxins and furans were found during the study done in 2006 by the University of Houston and Parsons? The concentrations of these chemicals should be stated here in this document so the reader has a relative idea on the amount of preexisting concentrations of these chemicals.	
GLO-3	1.1.3	5	Table 1-1	The amount of data for the surface water moles is limited. As stated in footnote two, only one TMDL sample out of six was collected within the USEPA's Preliminary Site Perimeter; therefore, only a total of only three surface water samples that were collected from within the Site Perimeter. It is recommended that more data be collected before any results are concluded.	
GLO-4	1.1.3	5	Footnote 4	See comments above; it is imprudent to have a model and verification of model predictions being based on such limited data.	
GLO-5	2.1	9	3	The report states that historical data was used for the high flow events in the sediment transport model. When was the last 100-year flood that occurred in the Preliminary Site Perimeter?	
GLO-6	2.1	10	1	Please expound on why the high-flow event of 1994 was chosen over the other high-flow events that occurred in the area.	
GLO-7	2.1	12	1	The last sentence before Section 2.2 reads that the results from a 21-year sediment transport calibration simulation indicated that there is a net deposition will occur within the Site Perimeter on a "long-term basis". Please define "long-term basis". Is this over that same 21-year period? If so, please state in the text.	
GLO-8	General	General	General	The report needs to be amended to consider the findings of the ACOE completed in the report dated October 2013. This report states clearly that the cap has stability issues, especially with slope and material gradation. It is possible that the way the cap is now, additional pollutants can enter the environment via continued erosion. As the report states now (page 19, paragraph 2), the model for chemical transport to simulate future (i.e. post-TCRA cap) conditions, uses dioxin and furan concentrations of zero. This is based on the assumption that no further erosion would be occurring after the cap had been placed. This is not what the ACOE report has found due to the potential of erosion due to design and construction issues with the cap.	
GLO-9	General	General	General	This report does not take into account any post flood activities that will occur, especially dredging. With the sediment deposition carrying pollutants into a shipping channel, there will be dredging to clear any build up sedimentation. Dredging polluted sediments will cause more chemical transfer to the environment. Please discuss this factor in the report.	
GLO-10	General	General	General	As with comment GLO-9, even after a smaller flood even that causes minimal sediment transfer, any build up of additional sediment in the shipping channels will eventually cause increased prop-wash from vessels. Already there is evidence from aerial photography of ships in the vicinity of the Site Perimeter kicking up bottom sediments from the shipping channel. This activity can increase the amount of chemical transfer to the environment. Please discuss the potential for this occurrence in the report.	